DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 007 EA 010 208

TITLE Charles F. Kettering Foundation and /I/D/E/A Mission in Educational Leadership and Management. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Merrimack Education Center, Chelmsford, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton, Ohio.
PUB DATE 7 Sep 76
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Educational Administration; Educational Improvement; Leadership Training; *Management Development; *Program Descriptions

ABSTRACT

This report describes a program sponsored by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation that attempted to help practicing educational administrators take advantage of available materials and resources to improve their leadership and management skills. The program centered around four Educational Management Development Centers consisting of school districts working alone, with other school districts, or with a nearby university. Each center was expected to search out and test new approaches to improving leadership and management in the context of operating schools and school districts. The overall aim of the program was to monitor the search and development efforts of the various centers and to analyze the reasons for their success or lack of success. The report briefly recounts the history of the program and presents some general conclusions based on the experiences of the centers. The appendix contains an interim review of the program that was prepared near the end of its first year, as well as a summary of a related effort to establish a National Collegial Learning Team on School District Based Administrator Renewal Program, which was made up of representatives of six state departments of education. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I/D/E/A

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CHARLES F. KETTERING FOUNDATION AND /I/D/E/A/

MISSION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

FINAL REPORT

ED148007

EA 010 208

It was no surprise to our staff developing the /I/D/E/A/ Change Program for Individually Guided Education when they "discovered" that leadership and management capabilities of participating schools and school districts had an important influence on the degree of success with IGE. Accordingly, we began planning in 1972 a research effort into leadership and management needs and opportunities in education.

We began our inquiry by interviewing practicing school administrators, personnel in universities and other institutions concerned with training, and individuals knowledgeable about management in other fields. The testimony we gathered from many administrators about the preparation they had received and about training opportunities available to their colleagues and staffs was characterized by disappointment and discouragement. Similar dissatisfaction was reflected in much of the professional literature we reviewed. Those responsible for training also expressed doubt about the usefulness of many approaches to administrator preparation.

Perhaps the strength and pervasiveness of this dissatisfaction was more than we expected. A parallel inquiry had identified a vast array of conferences, workshops, institutes, and new materials for improving leadership and management.[1] Many colleges and

[1] A study by Merrimack Education Center under Charles F. Kettering Foundation sponsorship on research and practice in inservice training of school administrators.

universities were reporting new dimensions to degree and preparation programs for educational administrators.

We reached the conclusion early that development of still another set of training materials was not a suitable beginning point. The challenge was to discover or invent ways to get school administrators to use more effectively what was available.

Our approach was to get into the "laboratory"--the field of practice--to learn more about how management systems of education worked in relation to efforts to improve those systems. We selected four different institutions to participate with us in this search. Carnegie-Mellon University, the Allegheny County Intermediate Unit, and a cluster of school districts in the Pittsburgh area; Tulane University and clusters of schools within the New Orleans school district; the Merrimack Education Center, a voluntary collaborative of 20 school districts in northeast Massachusetts; and a single large metropolitan school district, Dade County (Miami) Florida.

We asked these Educational Management Development Centers to think of themselves as "Centers for Social Invention." We wanted them to search out and test for themselves new approaches to improving leadership and management in the context of operating schools and school districts.

While we offered no blueprint for the Centers to follow, we did agree on several guidelines that seemed to offer promise of successful "social invention." Some of these were:

1. Involve practitioners as participants in the search for new methods rather than as subjects to be treated.

2. Operate the Centers in "neutral turf" to avoid habit patterns and constraints of existing institutions.

3. Carry out the search for new ways within clusters of institutions so there can be a collective commitment to the effort and a sharing of experiences.

4. Draw upon the analytical capability of several disciplines and upon experiences in other fields of management practice.

Each party to the Centers--both universities and school districts--was centrally concerned with developing programs that made a difference. Our aim was to help monitor and analyze these search and development efforts to document the differences that were made and to explain the reasons for success (or lack of it).

Approaches of the Centers varied greatly. Carnegie-Mellon University worked with a cluster of school districts in Allegheny County through projects that linked the skills of university personnel to various needs within the districts. Tulane University worked with clusters of principals--a high school principal and the feeder junior high and elementary school principals--in planning and problem solving with respect to their concerns bringing in skill development experiences as the principals sensed the need for them. Merrimack Education Center functioned as a "broker" linking needs identified by administrators in their 20-district voluntary collaborative with sources of inservice training.

While Dade County, Florida has an inservice training program for administrators within the district, other pressing demand--ranging from violence in the schools to the financial crunch--prevented the district from moving ahead with us in an intensive analysis of their experiences.

Because of budget restrictions, we concluded our involvement with the Centers at the end of the second developmental year. As indicated above, Dade County, Florida participated only for a brief period in the project and then returned the unused portion of the grant funds.

The three Centers which did participate fully in the program continue to operate and develop on their own resources. Interim reports from these Centers are on file and available for review.

Other reports available from the project follow:

1. Report by Merrimack Education Center on survey of literature and practice in inservice for school administrators.

2. Two concept papers by Dr. Anthony Cresswell, Northwestern University; one on a concept of educational administration, the second on evaluating inservice training programs.

3. Final and interim reports from Merrimack Education Center, Carnegie-Mellon University and Tulane University. First year interim report from Dade County, Florida.

4. Other occasional papers and documents related to work of the Centers prepared by respective staffs of the Centers. An interim report by this writer about the mission is attached. (Attachment A).

Just prior to ending our involvement with the Leadership and Management Center development, we were instrumental in helping the Colorado State Department of Education form an eight-state network of State Education agencies to exchange ideas on how to promote local school district based administrator programs. The series of meetings with representatives from these eight states will continue through February, 1977.

Our general conclusion is that this approach has been helpful for the states involved. We have reinforced what they perceive to be a responsibility of growing importance. Though the participating states have generally assigned top-level administrators to participate in these sessions and to have responsibility for the programs, there has been considerable change in personnel since the project was begun. A summary of the program is attached. (Attachment B).

Though our work on this mission was ended prematurely, reports from these developmental efforts offer numerous insights into ways of improving inservice training of school administrators. The remainder of this report is devoted to some general conclusions based on our experience with the projects.

Some General Conclusions

Responding to Personal Needs of Administrators Themselves

It is not surprising that school administrators are problem oriented. Most are so busy dealing with pressures of day-to-day problems they tend not to anticipate future problems or to deal with fundamental issues.

The Centers found that if they were to communicate with the administrator and be useful to him, they had to respond to what was "giving him heat today." Accordingly, Center programs became oriented toward problem solving. The Centers' search was for modes of problem solving that would not only leave a new system in place but also would leave a legacy of new skills. The response with opportunities to "learn how" as well as learn about was well received.

Relating Means to Ends

District level school administrators--especially superintendents--rate management science technologies--such as Management by Objectives (MBO) and Program/Planning/Budgeting Systems (PPBS)--as high priority needs. Their real concern, however, is solving day-to-day problems rather than attending institutes or workshops on these concepts. Long-range plans to institutionalize these technologies also have a lower priority than solving immediate problems.

Like other public administrators, school principals and superintendents are confronted with decisions that must be made within relatively short time frames that apparently can't wait for skill development courses or careful application of management science technologies. There is an expressed interest in installing and using the latest management technologies; however, many of these efforts tend to become ends in themselves rather than being viewed in terms of impacting on program improvement.

Recognizing Some Implications of Ambiguity

We believe there are some features of the educational system that keep many school administrators busy performing many of their management functions in ways that are not tied closely to the success of the rest of the system. It is our impression, for example, that the characteristic vagueness of goals in education contributes to dealing with trivia.

In part, we believe this may result from the tendency for goals to be stated at a level of generality that facilitates a consensus and keeps the institution operating. Get beyond

these levels of generality, and disagreement among the staff, between the staff and community, and within the community begin to get in the way.

Getting Beyond the First Request

We have learned that there is initial interest on the part of many administrators in a package that will solve their problems for them. Paralleling some of our experiences in the Study of Educational Change, however, we often heard, "Tell Us What to Do! But--Don't Tell Me What to Do!" Ultimately, however, most administrators responded positively to participating in processes to help clarify problems and to develop skills to deal with them. These problem-solving activities focused on specific situations on the administrator's turf with a collaborative network for sharing experiences and insights show considerable promise.

Finding Illustrations that Relate

There are many management training materials available from business and industry. However, illustrations and applications need to be adapted to school-related situations by trainers if they are to be viewed by educational administrators as useful. While dissatisfaction is expressed with training received from schools of education, educators are reluctant to turn themselves over exclusively to schools of business. Special effort is needed in training situations for educators to generalize from non-educational situations. To be useful we need case studies and illustrations from educational situations.

Seeking New Approaches to an "Old Problem"

We've learned that many efforts to install program planning and budgeting systems in education have collapsed under the weight of talking about goals. One of the Centers approached use of a PPBS concept by assuming the educational goals were there and that everyone knew them. They began with the budget side of the system and later moved to talking about the program elements.

Admitting the Obvious--Everything Is Connected to Everything Else

Though it is easy to talk about various segments of schooling as if they were independent--the instructional system, the management system, and the policy system--experience of the Centers reaffirm strongly the frequent observation that "everything is connected to everything else."

Consideration of new management techniques and management practices cannot easily be separated from either the instructional system or the policy system of a school district. Dealing with policy issues requires skills in the policy sciences that rarely have been a subject of study by school administrators.

Finding Different Strokes for Different Folks

Involvement of interdisciplinary teams from universities as well as representatives from other fields of practice in an improvement program such as this is not easy to obtain. Not all university and business personnel are enthusiastic about going out to work with school principals. School administrators, on the other hand, found association with professors and businessmen a very rewarding experience. Finding appropriate reward mechanisms was a task recognized but not widely achieved.

Putting Some Order into Disorder

As in other professions, the need for renewal skill development is continuous after initial certification. The professional notion that people should pursue their own training after certification has resulted in an unsystematic approach to improvement for many school administrators. It occurs largely on weekends, evenings and in summer schools where it is rarely situationally relevant. Designing plans for inservice training where and when it's needed will be a continuing goal of each Center.

A Note on Approach

As indicated elsewhere in this report, the Centers that did move forward in this effort continue to develop their own programs. They differ from one another substantially.

Despite our efforts to bring directors of these programs together and to share written information among them, it is my conclusion that they learned little from one another. The Centers began under the direction of individuals who began their work from different perspectives--perspectives that were guiding the work they were previously engaged in.

Those who were managing the design and operation of the Centers had different developmental experiences throughout the project. They worked on shaping <u>their</u> programs and they were successful in their respective endeavors in terms of involving the participation and financial support of school districts and district personnel. It was too early at the conclusion of our involvement with the Centers to accurately assess the difference they made in the functioning of personnel and, subsequently, in effectiveness of schools. Parties to each of the Centers <u>thought</u>

they were making a difference, however.

The Kettering Foundation did not develop a leadership-management program of its own through this effort. It helped support and guide the work of three other agencies in development of their programs.

We did not evolve a staff capability to go out and help another agency develop any one of the models; however, we could work with any of the Centers and they could help others implement the program they developed.

Support for and involvement with only one center would have enabled /I/D/E/A/ staff to concentrate their energies more directly on development of a single model. A more concentrated approach may have resulted in a closer sense of ownership by the Foundation than developed through involvement with several different projects.

Goals and programs grow out of the interests, experiences and skills of people. People--rather than institutions--learn from experience.

The individuals responsible for developing the respective Management Development Centers learned a great deal and they shared in written reports and in discussions what they learned. How much use others can or will make of this knowledge is problematic.

Charles L. Willis

ATTACHMENT A

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES, INC.

TO: Education Program Council

FROM: Charles L. Willis

DATE: July 15, 1975

SUBJECT: Information for July Council Meeting

An interim review of the Leadership/Management Mission is attached. I'll have some additional comments to share at our July meeting.

CLW:vb
Attachment

KETTERING FOUNDATION AND /I/D/E/A/

MISSION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

An Interim Review

---

1. Assumptions

   a. Management and Leadership are significant

   b. Management and Leadership in education are underdeveloped.

   c. Arrangements to develop competency in Management and Leadership are not adequate.

2. Original mission outcomes (purposes) sought

   a. One or more proven approaches (on criteria to be determined) to improving Management and Leadership in precollegiate education.

   b. An arrangement design that will lead to application of one or more of these proven approaches on a widespread scale.

3. General strategy

   a. Begin a set of field studies to generate the research questions and the research design.

   b. Provide support for research/evaluation functions relating to these efforts at "social invention."

      - To document effects obtained

      - To explain why

   c. Prepare some scholarly concept papers along the way

      - Analysis of concepts in Leadership and Management

      - Evaluation in Leadership and Management

      - Other approaches to improving Leadership and Management

      - A new approach

4. Guiding concepts for this effort in "social invention"

   a. Neutral turf

   b. Cluster of institutions

   c. Practitioners as participants in development

   d. Analytical capability of various disciplines

   e. Input from other fields of management practice

   f. Focus on real problems

   g. Orientation toward search

   h. Reliance on local resources

5. Four laboratory sites

   a. Pittsburgh: Carnegie-Mellon University, Allegheny County Intermediate Unit; approximately a dozen school districts.

   b. New Orleans: Tulane University, portion of New Orleans School District.

   c. Northeast Massachusetts: Merrimack Education Center and 20 school districts (a voluntary collaborative).

   d. Miami, Florida: Dade County Public Schools.

6. Original timetable

   a. Fiscal 1974: first pilot year (Pittsburgh and New Orleans each had six-month planning grant: March - August, 1973)

   b. Fiscal 1975: first-year field test

   c. Fiscal 1976 second-year field test: information materials in preliminary form: implementation plan designed

   d. Fiscal 1977: complete production of information and strategy materials; implementation plan set in motion.

7. Adjusted timetable

a. First year field-tests end

- Pittsburgh Center, October 31, 1975
- New Orleans Center, November 30, 1975
- Merrimack Center, October 31, 1975
- Dade County, October 31, 1975

b. Fiscal 1976 to be devoted to final evaluation and reporting: Mission terminated.

8. Emphasis during current year:

a. Theory development

(1) Getting more explicit statements of relationships believed to explain conditions relating to management and leadership in education and its improvement.

(2) Linking and adjusting these explanations with our experiences (experiments) in the laboratories.

b. Refining research/evaluation designs.

Our concern here is with identifying the "bottom-line" variables believed important to impact upon and the most powerful explanatory factors, dimensions or variables that we believe should be monitored and how to monitor them.

(1) What ideas will serve as an adequate basis for data collection? (How can we get a handle on what happens?)

- What do we plan to study? How will the many variables that might be studied be prioritized?
- What dimensions are believed to be the most important? What factors are likely to offer the most powerful explanations for success or failure of the effort?
- What hypotheses can be stated?

(2) What are the most logical and feasible sources of data relating to the variables selected?

- Administrator
- Teachers
- Board members

- The public
- External observers
- Records

(3) What types of data should be collected?

- Written information about personnel
- Written information about practices
- Taped interviews
- Tapes of meetings
- Observation records

(4) What is the data collection plan?

(5) What is the reporting plan?

9. Some optional dependent variables at Center and District level

a. Behavior of administrators: identifying problems and analyzing situations, collecting and analyzing data, taking action, analyzing results....

b. Changes in administrator attitudes about management role

c. Changes in administrative structures of LEA's attributable to Center

d. Participation in new and different amounts of training

e. Satisfaction of staff and sponsors with management performance

10. Factors for us to look at overall to see if we're successful

a. Acceptance by the people involved

b. Integration of Center activities with management and operation of the local education agencies (personnel and organizational linkages).

11. Variables that are likely to affect a Center's success

a. Contextual

- Previous experience with improvement programs
- Legal constraints

- Motivation, reward systems, incentives for participation
- Other demands on time
- Credibility of project director
- Ambiguity/clarity of the concept
- Power and influence relationships
- Financial resources

b. Process variables

- How the Center was started
- Management style of the Center
- Involvement in decision processes
- Nature of communications, activities and patterns
- Resource mobilization
- Parallel social events

c. Character of our relationships with the Centers

12. Intervention strategy development

a. Pittsburgh: moved from seminar during first year to problem identification and solution within the districts followed by workshops on "how we got the problem solved."

b. New Orleans: clusters of schools and clinical team

c. Massachusetts: moving from needs assessment and workshops on skill development to focus on problem solving

d. Miami: seminars for top management to set direction

13. What we're learning about Management and Leadership

a. Public administrators innundated with problems. Need for decisions won't wait for skill development courses or careful application of management science technology. Need ways to relate the learning process at point where administrators are confronted with problems--problems they perceive.

b. Skill development typically comes after certification. Professional notion is that people pursue their own training after certification: weekends, evenings, summer school in unsystematic fashion.

c. There's no shortage of courses, consultants, conferences, kits, institutes....

d. Management science technologies tend to become ends in themselves.

e. Fewer opportunities in education than in business for new hiring to get new skills.

14. What we're learning about strategy we're using

a. Centers must be successful--less concerned than we are about systematically recording and reporting their experiences.

b. Institutions that are concerned with operating and providing social services devote their resources to these ends. Considerable effort is required to get them to include systematic inquiry and development on their agenda.

c. Center staff internalizes what they're learning because of direct involvement. Being one step away complicates this for us.

d. Differences among the Centers are significant. Can't hand them blueprints for strategy or timetable.

e. We need to be more explicit about use of our funds for systematic inquiry--evaluation and research.

f. Need to be more explicit about the guiding concepts, especially involvement of business.

g. Need more communication links among the projects; closer geographically may have facilitated this.

h. There are a number of similar efforts getting underway. We need to find ways to interact with them and share what is being learned.

i. It takes time....

ATTACHMENT B

National Collegial Learning Team
on
School District Based Administrator Renewal Programs

Team Members

Edward Brainard
Director, Leadership Development
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (303) 892-3081

Gary Emanuel (Dr.)
Assistant to the Superintendent
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Telephone: (602) 271-4720

Jack Frisk
Deputy Superintendent
Office of Public Instruction
Olympia, Washington 98501
Telephone: (206) 753-1880

James P. Kiley
Deputy Director
Office of Educational Accountability
Nevada Department of Education
Carson City, Nevada 89701
Telephone: (702) 885-5700, Ext. 240

A. K. Luke
Associate Superintendent
Idaho Department of Education
Boise, Idaho 83720
Telephone: (208) 384-2165

LeRoy Ortgiesen
Assistant Commissioner, Administration
Nebraska Department of Education
233 South 10th Street
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Catherine Stehly
Assistant to the Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Education
Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Telephone: (612) 296-6074

Calvin Whatcott
Utah State Board of Education
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 533-5431

Charles Willis, Program Officer
Institute for Development of
Educational Activities
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5335 Far Hills Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45429
Telephone: (513) 434-7300

Dr. James E. Conner, Director
SEA/Staff Development Project
Council of Chief State School Officers
1201 Sixteenth St. N.W. - #304
Washington, D.C. 20036

May 27, 1976

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State Office Building, 201 E. Colfax
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone (303) 892-2212
Calvin M. Frazier, *Commissioner*

July 15, 1975

The Colorado Department of Education and I/D/E/A, an affilitate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, are beginning a National CollegialLearning Team on School District Based Administrator Renewal Programs. The team will consist of six educators from six state departments of education. Enclosed is a beginning description of the idea. It describes the goals of administrator renewal activities under way in Colorado and procedures for beginning the National Collegial Team.

The purpose of this program is to stimulate a trial of the Collegial Team concept in the development of local school district leadership. To do this a National Collegial Team Project will be initiated involving these six states. The Project will underwrite one-half of the air travel for a State Department team member from your state to come to Denver four times during the 18-month project. Each State Department will need to underwrite the other half of the travel cost. In addition each state will assume any costs for implementing the Collegial Team experiment within each state.

After you have reviewed these documents, should the idea of this Project be of interest to you, we invite your Department of Education to be a member in this endeavor. Furthermore, we invite you to designate the person to serve as a part of this team and be our contact point.

I am asking Dr. Edward Brainard, Director, Leadership Development, Colorado Department of Education, to correspond with you to provide more details. Do not hesitate to contact him for additional information at 303-892-3081.

Sincerely,

Calvin M. Frazier
Commissioner of Education

Enclosures
Same letter sent to: Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Minnesota, Washington, Nebraska

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State Office Building, 201 E. Colfax
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone (303) 892-2212
Calvin M. Frazier, *Commissioner*

National Collegial Learning Team on

School District Based Administrator Renewal Programs

May 14, 1975

SPONSORS. This endeavor is jointly sponsored by the Colorado Department of Education and /I/D/E/A/ (Institute for the Development of Educational Activities), an affiliate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation.

GOALS. The initial goals for the team are --

1. In addition to the Colorado Department of Education, select five state departments of education (SDE) who desire to provide leadership for stimulating school district based, planned, and operated renewal (professional growth) programs for school administrators. Each SDE in this project designates one professional staff member to serve on the team and to achieve for the SDE the goals of this project.

2. Among the representatives of the six SDE, form a collegial learning team and establish communications among the team members. Over an eighteen month period the team will conduct for itself learning activities to educate its members on processes for providing state level leadership for stimulating school district based, planned, and operated renewal programs for school administrators.

3. Following the first team meeting, the national collegial team member of each SDE develops in his or her state a collegial team of representatives from a minimum of five school districts. These will be administrators who are providing leadership for administrator renewal programs in their districts. Each selected SDE professional staff member provides catalytic leadership for the team and the participating school districts.

Administrator Renewal Activities in Colorado. Since mid-1974, the Colorado Department of Education through its Director of Leadership Development, Dr. Edward Brainard, has been providing leadership in Colorado for stimulating the development of school district based, planned, and operated administrator renewal (professional growth) programs for middle management level school administrators.

To achieve this purpose the Colorado Department of Education has three goals which are to --

1. Provide field services designed to assist interested school districts in developing school district based and operated administrator renewal programs for middle management personnel.

2. Provide state level services which support local school district developed and operated administrator renewal programs and foster communication and program sharing activities among the participating school systems.

3. Involve the leaders of the school district based renewal programs in the management of the Colorado Department of Education's administrator renewal services so that the ownership for the overall endeavor is shared by school administrators throughout the state.

Presently twenty-nine Colorado school districts are involved in the creation of administrator renewal programs. Each district develops its own program.

The processes being used in Colorado are largely based on the results of the administrator renewal and individualized continuing education for school administrators programs of forty-five school districts throughout the nation. These districts created such programs during the period of 1968-1974 under the leadership of the CFK (Charles F. Kettering) Ltd. Foundation which completed its work in 1974. Edward Brainard was the foundation's president.

Procedures for inaugurating the project and the National Collegial Learning Tea.

A. Project Phases

Phase I. Invite five state departments of education to participate in the National Collegial Team project.

1. Each SDE will designate a staff member who will provide leadership for school district based administrator renewal programs as follows:

   a. Organize a grouping of a minimum of five school districts interested in developing administrator renewal programs.

   b. Form a six member collegial learning team on administrator renewal programming of the program leaders of each of the five districts and the SDE staff member.

2. Each of the five SDE program leaders must agree to become a member of the national collegial team.

3. Provide leadership to the state's cluster of school districts interested in organizing and operating administrator renewal programs.

4. Time Period: June 1975 - Fall 1976.

Phase II. To be determined by the National Collegial Team.

B. Meetings of the National Collegial Team

Late Summer or early Fall 1975
Early Winter 1976
Summer 1976
Late Fall 1976

C. Project Funding

1. /I/D/E/A/, an affiliate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, will cover one-half of the air travel for each SDE team member to and from Denver for each of the four National Collegial Team meetings.

2. Other in-state costs and travel and per diem costs to Denver will need to be covered by each participating SDE. (Note: The Colorado Department of Education does not provide participating school districts with funds to operate administrator renewal programs.)

3. The Colorado Department of Education and Edward Brainard are not receiving any funds for this project.

D. Sketch of Activities for First Meeting of the National Collegial Team. (In preparation for the first meeting the materials listed in Part E below will be sent to each team member.)

1. Experiencing how a collegial team operates and how to organize a collegial team. (A collegial team is a form of task force uniquely designed for renewal or inservice education purposes.)

2. How we started and are sustaining administrator renewal programs in our school districts: Case study reports from administrator renewal program leaders.

Participants in this session will be drawn from the following:

Dr. George Carnie, Assistant Superintendent, Northglenn School District
Dr. Donn Kesselheim, Deputy Superintendent, Colorado Springs School District
Ralph Neumann, Curriculum Director, Rocky Ford School District
Dr. Will Hawkins, Superintendent, Brighton School District
James Elliott, Director, Elementary Education, Greeley School District
James Elliott, Director, Elementary Education, Greeley School District
James Metzdorf, Coordinator, Staff Development, Jefferson County School District
Pete Shannon, Assistant Superintendent, Denver Public Schools
Roy Brubacher, Colorado Department of Education

3. Processes and procedures a state education department can use to stimulate the development of school district based administrator renewal programs.

4. Establishing individual and National Collegial Team goals for first six months.

5. Review of the reading materials (see part E below). Each team member will be assigned leadership responsibilities for this portion of the program.

E. Materials to be provided each team member:

1. Colorado Department of Education goals and MBO plan for stimulating school district based administrator renewal programs.

2. "Sequence of Leadership Functions of the Colorado Department of Education for Stimulating the Development of School District Administrator Renewal Programs."

3. Colorado Department of Education Series of Single Concept Papers on Administrator Renewal.

"What Is an Administrator Renewal Program?"
"The Talent Survey"
"The Collegial Team: A Procedure for Supporting an Administrator Renewal Program"
"Major Sources of Human Resources to Support an Administrator Renewal Program"
"Starting An Administrator Renewal Program: Eight Ideas"
"Administrator Renewal Programs and the Colorado Department of Education"
"Suggested Contents of an Administrator Renewal Plan"

4. Monographs

"Self Performance Achievement Record"
"Individualizing Continuing Education for School Administrators"
"Administrator Renewal: The Leadership Role in Collegial Team Development"
"School and Self Assessment Processes: A Guidebook for School Administrators"
"Diagnosing Professional Climate of Schools"